

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2012 DEC 17 AM 9:27

STATE OF WASHINGTON

BY h
DEPUTY

NO. 43744-9-II

**COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

DAVID S. DIVIS,

Appellant,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE PATROL,

Respondent.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

ROBERT M. MCKENNA
Attorney General

SUSAN SACKETT DANPULLO
Assistant Attorney General
WSBA No. 24249

Labor and Personnel Division
PO Box 40145
Olympia, WA 98504
(360) 664-4167

pm 12/14/12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	ISSUES.....	1
	A. Should the Final Order of Chief Batiste determining that demotion was the appropriate level of discipline be upheld given that Divis did not assign error to the factual findings of the Board and therefore they are verities on appeal? (Appellant's Assignment of Error #1, a, d, e).....	1
	B. Where the legislature has place, discretion with the WSP Chief for imposing discipline on commissioned officers, should the Final Order determining that demotion was the appropriate level of discipline be upheld given that deference is owed the administrative agency and where the discipline imposed was not arbitrary and capricious. (Appellant's Assignment of Error #1b, c, and g).....	1
	C. Was the appearance of fairness doctrine violated where a reasonably prudent and disinterested observer would conclude that Divis obtained a fair, impartial, and neutral hearing before the Board? (Appellant's Assignment of Error #1f)	1
III.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
	A. Factual Background	2
	B. Procedural History	7
IV.	ARGUMENT	11
	A. Standard of Review.....	11
	B. Chief Batiste Properly Issued the Final Order of December 2, 2011.	13
	1. Chief Batiste did not alter or make new findings of fact in the Final Order.....	15

2.	The Final Order's conclusions of law are supported by the findings of the Board.	18
a.	The Board decision and the Final Order contain the same findings regarding Divis' violation of WSP Regulations 8.00.030(a) and 8.00.010.	19
b.	The Final Order's description of Divis' conduct does not vary in any significant manner from the Board's description.	21
C.	Chief Batiste Properly Considered All The Appropriate Just Cause Elements In Determining That Demotion Was The Proper Discipline In This Case	23
1.	The Final Order properly considered a prior Settlement Agreement between Divis and WSP.	23
2.	The discipline imposed was not arbitrary and capricious.....	27
a.	Demotion is the appropriate and proportional level of discipline for Divis' misconduct.	28
b.	Demotion is non discriminatory and similar to what another employee in a comparable situation would receive.	31
c.	The employee's complete work record had been considered.	33
d.	Demotion to the rank of Trooper is progressive discipline.	34
D.	The WSP Investigation Was Conducted Fairly	35
1.	The Board found that the investigation was conducted fairly.	35
2.	Divis cannot prove prejudice from the alleged errors in the complaint or investigation process.	37

a.	Failing to interview identified people did not prejudice Divis.	38
b.	AIM is a reference manual.....	39
c.	Consideration and review of performance evaluations is properly an issue for the agency decision-maker, not the investigator.	42
E.	There Was No Violation Of The CBA	43
1.	The charges in the incident report are specific and provided Divis with the nature of the allegations against him.....	44
2.	Identifying the department as the complainant is authorized and consistent with the CBA.	46
F.	There Has Been No Violation Of The Appearance Of Fairness Doctrine	47
V.	CONCLUSION	50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ARCO Prods. Corp. v. Wash. Utils. & Transp. Comm’n</i> , 125 Wn.2d 805, 888 P.2d 728 (1995).....	12, 27
<i>Brown v. Dep’t of Soc. & Health Servs.</i> , 145 Wn. App. 177, 185 P.3d 1210 (2008).....	13
<i>Burnham v. Dep’t of Soc. & Health Servs.</i> , 115 Wn. App. 435, 63 P.3d 816 (2003).....	11
<i>Callecod v. Wash. State Patrol</i> , 84 Wn. App. 663, 929 P.2d 510 (1997).....	13
<i>City of Hoquiam v. Pub. Empl. Relations Comm’n</i> , 97 Wn.2d 481, 646 P.2d 129 (1982).....	47, 48
<i>City of Univ. Place v. McGuire</i> , 144 Wn.2d 640, 30 P.3d 453 (2001).....	12
<i>Clausing v. State</i> , 90 Wn. App. 863, 955 P.2d 394 (1998).....	47, 48, 49
<i>Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill</i> , 470 U.S. 532, 105 S. Ct. 1487 (1985).....	7
<i>Davis v. State Dep’t of Transp.</i> , 138 Wn. App. 811, 159 P.3d 427 (2007).....	43
<i>Fuller v. Empl. Sec. Dep’t of State of Wash.</i> , 52 Wn. App. 603, 762 P.2d 367 (1988).....	11, 12
<i>Goldsmith v. State, Dep’t of Soc. & Health Servs.</i> , 169 Wn. App. 573, 280 P.3d 1173 (2012).....	11, 13
<i>Heinmiller v. Dep’t of Health</i> , 127 Wn.2d 595, 903 P.2d 433 (1995), <i>cert. denied</i> , 518 U.S. 1006, 116 S. Ct. 2526, 135 L. Ed. 2d 1051 (1996).....	12, 27